

by the disclosure.” Applicants respectfully disagree and believe that there is a misunderstanding as to what is being claimed in independent Claim 81.

More specifically, independent Claim 81 recites “an electrode for applying a voltage to the semiconductor island through the first silicon nitride oxide film and the second silicon nitride oxide film.” Hence, the electrode (e.g. gate electrode) is for applying a voltage. That voltage is applied to the semiconductor island through the first silicon nitride oxide film and the second silicon nitride oxide film. This is discussed in the present application at, for example, at page 5, ln. 28 - page 3, (which discusses a gate electrode provided to apply a voltage through a first insulating layer to the active layer of an inverted stagger type or bottom gate type TFT), and in Embodiment 1, at page 15, ln. 10 et seq. Figs. 5A-7D show an example of Embodiment 1 (of a bottom gate type TFT) having a gate electrode 602 formed on a substrate, a first insulating layer 603 formed of a nitrogen-rich silicon oxide film 603a and a silicon nitride oxide film 603b formed over the gate electrode, and an semiconductor layer 604 formed over the insulating layer (i.e. oxide films). Hence, the gate electrode applies a voltage to the semiconductor island through the first silicon nitride oxide film and the second silicon nitride oxide film, as recited in Claim 81.

Independent Claim 81 does not mean nor does it claim that an electrode is located through the first silicon nitride oxide film and the second silicon nitride oxide film.

Accordingly, the written description in the present application as filed clearly supports Claims 81-85. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner has the following rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting:

A. Claims 1 and 64-69 are rejected as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of US 6,380,558.

B. Claims 70-80 and 86-90 are rejected as being unpatentable over claims 31-35 of US 6,380,558.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are submitting a terminal disclaimer and the required fee. Accordingly, these rejections have been overcome, and it is respectfully requested that they be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 000026568